YEC and OEC

I agree fully with your assessments. The point I was making is that many YEC, like Ken Ham, will tell you that scientists cannot discern truth from looking at Creation for two reasons: 1) the Creation itself is cursed and 2) the noetic effect (ie mans fallen mind) makes any conclusions by man concerning God's creation suspect. When you tell them that also applies to our interpretation of Scripture, they will say that it is a misapplication as the Holy Spirit guides us when we read the bible and that they are just taking God's word at face value.  
   
I remember two things from years ago: 1) the idea of the perspicuity of Scripture, such that when it comes to the central theme of the Bible, such as the message of salvation, the Bible is clear. When we move farther away from that subject, say to how God created everything, it is not clear. 2) I also heard Hugh discuss the topic of the noetic effect on the web during the days of RTB's call-in webcasts. Here's a concise description of RTB's position on the noetic effect, “Our position at Reasons To Believe is that the noetic effects of the fall must be taken into account in evaluating the claims of mainstream science. The noetic effects are the various ways that sin negatively impacts and undermines human thinking and conclusions about reality. These effects are most evident where it pertains to human beliefs about God and God's authority over the lives of humans. It is virtually nonexistent where the God factor is not an issue, such as in how to design and build a microwave oven.” From<http://www.reasons.org/articles/defending-concordism-response-to-the-lost-world-of-genesis-one>  
   
So, I believe that the RTB position is correct concerning the noetic effect.

--This is a very tantalizing thread. The YEC has gone down this long road of trying to debunk dual revelation not because of a proper view of man, scripture, God or nature but because of a fear that OEC is directly tied to atheistic evolution.  
   
I think a distinction should be make concerning the effect of the fall on the un-regenerated mind, it is this mind that that is out of fellowship with the Holy Spirit and together with its love for sin will deny God.  
   
However this is also limited because unbelieving scientist can do valid science, which means the effects of the fall is limited on both non-believer and believers.  
 One interesting response YEC makes concerning this, is that this limit is only with respect to the science of the past...science about the present is valid but for the past it's difficult.  
   
I must admit this had an effect on me for a while, ..trying to grasp billions of years.  
 I like RTB, creation model based upon duel revelation because it has a balance, practical and reasonable view of God, scripture, man and natue.

--With all due respect to Mr. Noll, there are a few problems with the paragraph quoted below:   
1. It is true that our humanity limits us from having exhaustive knowledge. However, just because you don't know everything does not mean that you cannot know anything.  
 2. The natural world is fallen. Is it? Man fell, and there were changes to the reproductive process and the types and yields of plants. But the whole universe? Where does the Bible say that?  
 3. Bondage to decay. Actually, without the operation of the second law of thermodynamics Adam and Eve could not have had warm bodies or have even breathed. So it had to be present before the fall, ie, it is part of the original creation, not an effect of the fall.  
 4. The primary way the noetic effects of the fall show up is in our moral judgements. Once a set of numbers to be calculated is known, the morality of the person calculating does not effect the outcome. A Christian, an atheist, and a wiccan will get the same answer if they do the calculation correctly. Morality effects philosophy and psychology far more than math and science. An example of this is the current Mars rover. Designing, building, and sending it to mars were a triumph of the hard sciences. The purpose it was sent, to search for the Holy Grail of atheism (life on other planets), involves moral/philosophical/metaphysical issues directly effected by the fall.  
   
This reminds me of something I observed a number of years ago in a class on the history of science and religion at Biola several years ago. The outstanding Christian philosopher JP Moreland was a guest lecturer. Most of the people in the class were working in the MA Religion and Science program, and had backgrounds in science and engineering. They dismantled Dr. Moreland's assertions with technical questions that he could not answer. As he left he said, "I may be wrong but I know I'm not crazy".

--For many, the denial that there is a general revelation from which we can understand Creation is widespread:  
 “Wheaton College historian Mark Noll writes:  
   
'The height of foolishness is to confuse the tasks of creator and creature (Rom. 1). Humans are creatures, not the creator. As such we will always be limited by our finitude from seeing the whole picture. We will always be predisposed by our fallenness to misconstrue the results of historical inquiry for our own idolatrous satisfaction. We will always be trading the advantages that come from living in the God-ordained particularities of our own cultures for the blindness that comes from being unable to see what is so obvious to those who gaze upon the past from other frames of reference.'31  
   
In other words, it is impossible to discover the truth about creation by relying on our own knowledge, ideas and methods, simply because we are finite and fallen human beings. Not only does our humanity prohibit us from having exhaustive knowledge, but our fallen nature also inhibits our ability to perceive, to reason and to assess. Moreover, the object of scientific study—the natural world—is also fallen. While it still reveals the glory and greatness of God, it is, nevertheless, 'in bondage to decay' (Rom 8:20–22). The image it presents is, to some extent, distorted.”  
 From: <http://creation.com/scripture-and-general-revelation>  
 This would be the position that many of the YEC in my church would hold

--Some other book links perhaps of interest that I ran across while searching:  
 Creation.com's list of book reviews: <http://creation.mobi/article/3503>  
 Free online creation books: <http://nwcreation.net/booksonline.html>  
 I'm glad your church is willing to consider "all truth is God's truth" - that concept is considered wrong at our church.  
 On Mon, Oct 8, 2012 at 11:40 PM, tremereglory <[tremereglory@hotmail.com](mailto:tremereglory@hotmail.com)> wrote:  
   
I go to a church that is mostly YEC but most are willing to listen to any argument. In a few talks that I have given I said that as Christians we are after the truth as all truth is God's truth. They agree so I am given a fair and open hearing on my OEC ideas.  
   
I was given the following book by one of the pastors. He said that it is the best book he has ever read on YEC. The title of the book is "The Creation Answers Book" by Don Batten. Editor, David Catchpoole, Jonathan Sarfati, and Car Wieland. The deal that him and I have is this, I read the book, and then we discuss it. Both of us acknowledging that it does not really matter which one of us is correct in the age of the earth debate, all that matters is that we seek the truth and go where the evidence leads us.  
   
My question for all of you is this. Is anyone aware of someone else doing a critique of this book already and if so can they point me to it?  
   
Kevin Casper <http://creation.com/the-creation-answers-book-index>  
 The arguments look pretty standard, so I would think RTB's site would have articles on some of them, as well as here: <http://oldearth.org/>  
 John Hartnett and YEC Cosmology

Jingwei Xu <xujingwei5@gmail.com>: Jun 02 12:51PM -0500

I listened to the podcast and did some additional reading, including

Hartnett's page on AIG.

Here is my brief assessment. In order to solve the start light problem, 5th

dimension (original from Carmili, et. al) and an almost arbitrary inflation

in Day 4 (by Hartnett, no fine tuning) has to be introduced. This is pretty

high price to pay by moving away from Occam's Razor principle, by adding

assumptions, without adding many testable observations.

Also, the theory lacks too many details about star/galaxy formation,

spectrum broadening etc., and probably most importantly, without any

explanation of CMB (Cosmic Microwave Background).

Precise red-shift measure may disprove the distance proportional

prediction. Better understanding of Quasar should also shed some light.

Overall, the theory has few predictions, making testing hard. That's

probably why it hasn't gain traction.

"Kirby Hansen" <kirbyh@pacbell.net>: Jun 02 12:01PM -0700

I agree, Jingwei. Add to those difficulties the fact that the 5th dimension of velocity takes over from our 4th dimension of time only some unspecified distance in space beyond the solar system, and that Hartnett says the velocity 5th dimension is a scalar, not a vector, contrary to conventional physics.

----- Original Message -----

From: Jingwei Xu

To: rtb\_apologists@googlegroups.com

Sent: Thursday, June 02, 2016 10:51 AM

Subject: Re: John Hartnett and YEC Cosmology

I listened to the podcast and did some additional reading, including Hartnett's page on AIG.

Here is my brief assessment. In order to solve the start light problem, 5th dimension (original from Carmili, et. al) and an almost arbitrary inflation in Day 4 (by Hartnett, no fine tuning) has to be introduced. This is pretty high price to pay by moving away from Occam's Razor principle, by adding assumptions, without adding many testable observations.

Also, the theory lacks too many details about star/galaxy formation, spectrum broadening etc., and probably most importantly, without any explanation of CMB (Cosmic Microwave Background).

Precise red-shift measure may disprove the distance proportional prediction. Better understanding of Quasar should also shed some light. Overall, the theory has few predictions, making testing hard. That's probably why it hasn't gain traction.

On Fri, May 27, 2016 at 3:38 PM, Kirby Hansen <kirbyh@pacbell.net> wrote:

Hartnett's theory picks up on the theory of Moshe Carmeli, an Israeli physicist who died in 2007, who added a fifth dimension of velocity to Einstein's General Theory of Relativity. I don't think either Carmeli's or Hartnett's version has gained much traction with mainstream cosmologists or with YEC's. Hugh Ross and Jeff Zweerink interviewed Hartnett about his theory in 2009 in this I Didn't Know That podcast which I felt exposed the fact that neither Carmeli's nor Hartnett's theories have been observationally demonstrated as Einstein's theories have been.

http://www.reasons.org/podcasts/i-didnt-know-that/special-edition---primetime-idkt-podcast-interview-with-physicist-john-hartnett

Kirby Hansen

Los Altos, CA

----- Original Message -----

From: Jingwei Xu

To: rtb\_apologists@googlegroups.com

Sent: Friday, May 27, 2016 12:27 PM

Subject: John Hartnett and YEC Cosmology

One if my YEC friend (with physics Ph. D) believes John Hartnett's cosmology greatly improved the theory of Russell Humphrey. Anyone can comment about his theory? It seems to me not all YEC astronomers sided with him, otherwise, they would not propose asymmetric speed of light as alternative.

Thanks,

Jingwei Xu

Dallas, TX